- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) and 15 U.S.C. § 1121. This Court has related claim jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over defendant Windsor because defendant, among other things, operates food production facilities within the State of California, employs individuals within the State of California, and sells food products within and throughout the State of California.
- 4. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred within this District, a substantial part of the intellectual property that is the subject of the action is situated within this District, a substantial part of the food products that are the subject of this action were and are being sold within this District, and because products bearing infringing marks as alleged below, have been and are being sold within this District.

II. INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

5. This is a trademark case subject to district-wide assignment under Local Rule 3-2(c).

III. THE PARTIES

- 6. At all times relevant, plaintiff MGF was and is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business located in Salinas, Monterey County, California.
- 7. Defendant Windsor is a Texas Limited Partnership, formed and existing under the laws of the State of Texas, and operating substantial food production facilities and employing numerous persons in the City of Covina, California, and conducting substantial sales of food products throughout the State of California, including sales made from numerous retail stores situated within this District.
- 8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of the defendants presently named herein as Does 1 through 20, inclusive, are presently unknown to plaintiff MGF, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names.

3

7 8

6

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SHAPIRO BUCHMAN ROVINE & PATTON LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW WALNUT CREEK

Filed 03/07/2008

Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that each of said defendants designated as a Doe defendant participated in, assisted in, conspired in, or is in some manner responsible for the events and happenings herein referred to, and/or claims some right, title, or interest in the matters which are the subject of this action, and plaintiff will pray leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of said fictitiously named defendants when the same are ascertained. Plaintiff further alleges on information and belief that at all times mentioned herein, each of the defendants herein was the agent, representative, and/or employee of each of the remaining defendants and, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency, and are therefore responsible to plaintiff for their actions in such capacity.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

9. Plaintiff MGF owns the trade name, "Monterey Pasta Company" and "Monterey Pasta" as well as numerous federal trademarks for its pasta and pasta entrees, many of which include chicken. In particular, On January 30, 1996, plaintiff was issued Registration No. 1953489 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") for its trademark "Monterey Pasta Company" in class 30 for use in association with pasta and sauces. A copy of this registration certificate is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and made a part of this Complaint. This registration is now in full force and effect, unrevoked and uncanceled, and is owned by plaintiff. On November 17, 1998, plaintiff was issued Registration No. 2203576 by the USPTO for its trademark "Monterey Pasta Co. California's Finest Gourmet Pasta" in class 30 for use in association with pasta and sauces. A copy of this registration certificate is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and made a part of this Complaint. This registration is now in full force and effect, unrevoked and uncanceled, and is owned by plaintiff. Additionally, plaintiff is the registered owner of the domain name www.montereypasta.com, and actively uses such domain name in the promotion of its product lines. Collectively, the foregoing trade names, trademarks, and the domain name are referred to herein as the "subject trademarks."

- 10. At great expense and effort, plaintiff MGF has developed numerous pasta products which are sold under the subject trademarks. MGF has invested substantial sums of money to obtain registration of its trademarks. MGF has manufactured, distributed, promoted, and sold, and is now selling, pasta products throughout the United States under the subject trademarks, which have long been associated with MGF's pasta products.
- 11. Plaintiff MGF's sales of pasta products under the above-named subject trademarks have been substantial for decades, and plaintiff has invested substantial sums of money in advertising and marketing pasta products under the subject trademarks.
- 12. As a result of plaintiff MGF's advertising and sales of its pasta products under the subject trademarks, and the widespread consumption and use of the products by the public, such products have come to be, and now are, well and favorably known to the public under the subject trademarks, which have become distinctive for plaintiff's pasta goods sold in commerce.
- 13. As a result of its extensive sales and of the excellence of its food products, plaintiff MGF has built up and now enjoys valuable good will in its business as represented by the above-named subject trademarks.
- 14. Notwithstanding plaintiff MGF's use and registration of the subject trademarks, defendants have been selling, in interstate commerce and throughout the State of California, a pasta food product under the mark, "Chicken Monterey Pasta" ("Infringing Mark"), which is confusingly similar to the subject trademarks. At no time did plaintiff ever consent to defendant's use of the subject trademarks, or any confusingly similar mark. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark misleads and confuses consumers.
- 15. The Infringing Mark is a colorable imitation of the subject trademarks.

 Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that defendants' infringement and passing off of pasta products as their own constitutes a willful and malicious violation of plaintiff MGF's trademark rights, aimed at preventing or hindering plaintiff from continuing to COMPLAINT

9

10

11

13

14

17

21

19

28

build a business around a market it has long possessed. By misleading consumers, defendants are also unfairly "riding the coattails" of plaintiff's success.

Filed 03/07/2008

16. On April 23, 2007, plaintiff MGF sent its original notice and request to defendants to discontinue use of the Infringing Mark, because such use constituted an infringement of the subject trademarks. Defendants disregarded the notice and request, however, and continue to promote and sell food products in interstate commerce. throughout California, and within this District, utilizing the Infringing Mark, notwithstanding notice of the infringement.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as more particularly set forth below.

FIRST CLAIM-TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER LANHAM ACT

- Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference, as though specifically pleaded 17. herein, each of the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 16, as more particularly set forth above.
- 18. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark on pasta products is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive the public as to the identity and origin of goods, causing irreparable harm to plaintiff MGF for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark is damaging and will continue to damage MGF substantially and irrevocably, unless and until restrained by this Court.
- 19. By reason of the foregoing acts, defendants are liable to plaintiff MGF for damages, and other relief, for trademark infringement under 15 U.S.C. §1114.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as more particularly set forth below.

SECOND CLAIM-UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER LANHAM ACT

- 20. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference, as though specifically pleaded herein, each of the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 19, as more particularly set forth above.
- 21. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark to promote, market, or sell pasta products in direct competition with plaintiff MGF's subject trademarks constitutes unfair competition pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark and COMPLAINT

10

13

11

18

16

20

26

COMPLAINT

SHAPIRO BUCHMAN PROVINE & PATTON LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

WALNUT CREEK

misleading advertising and packaging is likely to cause confusion, mistake, and
deception among consumers. Moreover, the use of the Infringing Mark and misleading
advertising and packaging by defendants is likely to induce persons to buy, use and
recommend defendants' products when instead they intend to buy, use, and recommend
plaintiff MGF's products. Defendants also intentionally and wrongfully misrepresent the
origins of their goods. Such deception and mistake has and will cause great damage to
plaintiff MGF and has and will erode the good will that plaintiff has developed.
Defendants are unfairly trading on and appropriating the reputation and good will of
plaintiff MGF and are thereby deceiving the public.

Filed 03/07/2008

- 22. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that defendants' adoption and use of the Infringing Mark was and is deliberate and done with the intent of investing defendants' products with salability, caused by confusion of the public, which defendants would not otherwise enjoy.
- 23. Defendants' unfair competition has caused and will continue to cause damage to plaintiff MGF, and is causing irreparable harm to MGF for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as more particularly set forth below.

THIRD CLAIM-UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §17200, et seq.

- 24. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference, as though specifically pleaded herein, each of the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 23, as more particularly set forth above.
- 25. Defendants' actions alleged herein constitute unfair competition within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq...
- 26. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17203, plaintiff MGF is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief ordering defendants to cease this unfair competition, as well as disgorgement of all of defendants' profits associated with this unfair competition.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as more particularly set forth below.

FOURTH CLAIM-FALSE DESCRIPTION - "PALMING OFF"

- 27. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference, as though specifically pleaded herein, each of the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 26, as more particularly set forth above.
- 28. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark and misleading advertising and packaging are such a colorable imitation and copy of plaintiff MGF's subject trademarks established in the market that defendants' use thereof is likely to create confusion, or cause mistake, or to deceive consumers as to the affiliation, connection or association of plaintiff's products, or to deceive consumers as to the origin, sponsorship or approval of plaintiff's products. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that defendants' actions were and are malicious, willful, and deliberate and done with the intent of investing defendants' products with salability, caused by confusion of the public, which defendants would not otherwise enjoy.
- 29. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark and misleading advertising and packaging constitute a false description or representation of business or products under 15 U.S.C. §1125(a) (Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act).

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as more particularly set forth below.

FIFTH CLAIM-COMMON LAW INJURY TO BUSINESS REPUTATION

- 30. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference, as though specifically pleaded herein, each of the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 29, as more particularly set forth above.
- 31. Defendants' use of the Infringing Mark and false advertising injures and creates a likelihood of injury to plaintiff MGF's business reputation because persons encountering MGF and its pasta products are likely to and will believe that MGF is affiliated with or related to defendants, and any adverse reaction by the public to defendants and the quality of defendants' products and services or the nature of defendants' business will injure the business reputation of plaintiff MGF and the goodwill COMPLAINT

3

4

that plaintiff enjoys.

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

13 14

12

15 16 17

19

20

18

21 22

24

23

25 26

27

28

SHAPIRO BUCHMAN PROVINE & PATTON LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW WALNUT CREEK

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Filed 03/07/2008

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays that:

- 1. Defendants, and their officers, agents, employees, successors, assigns, attorneys and all other persons acting by and under defendants, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from: (a) using the Infringing Mark or any other counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation thereof, on or in connection with the manufacture, distribution, advertising, and sale of food products; (b) any manufacture, distribution, advertising, packaging and sale of food products that is likely to cause confusion, mistake, deception, or public misunderstanding as to the origin of plaintiff MGF's products or their connection to defendants.
- 2. Pursuant to 15 USC § 1117, defendants be held liable for damages suffered by plaintiff MGF resulting from the acts alleged herein, and that plaintiff be awarded treble damages according to proof arising from the above-described acts.
- 3. Defendants be required, pursuant to 15 USC § 1117, to account for and to pay over to plaintiff MGF all of defendants' profits resulting from sales of food products under the Infringing Mark, or any other counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of such mark.
- 4. Defendants be required, pursuant to 15 U.S.C § 118, to deliver to plaintiff MGF for destruction all labels, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, and advertising matter (including website pages or links) in defendants' possession, custody or under control of defendants bearing the Infringing Mark or any other counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of such mark;
- 5. Defendants be required to file with the Court and serve on plaintiff MGF within thirty (30) days after entry of the Injunction, a report in writing under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which defendants have complied with the Injunction.
- 6. The Court declare this to be an exceptional case and award plaintiff MGF COMPLAINT

7.

1

3

5

4

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

SHAPIRO BUCHMAN PROVINE & PATTON LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMPLAINT

8. Plaintiff MGF have such other and other further relief as this Court may

Plaintiff MGF be award its costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C §117.

deem just and proper, including remedies provided for in 15 U.S.C § 116 and 117 or under state law; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: March 5, 2008

SHAPIRO BUCHMAN PROVINE & PATTON LLP

By: John H. Patton, Cal. SBN 069261

Attorneys for Plaintiff Monterey Gourmet Foods,

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Monterey Gourmet Foods, Inc. hereby requests a jury trial in the aboveentitled action.

Dated: March 5, 2008

SHAPIRO BUCHMAN PROVINE & PATTON LLP

By: John H. Patton, Cal. SBN 069261

Attorneys for Plaintiff Monterey Gourmet Foods,

Inc.

Int. Cl.: 30

Prior U.S. Cl.: 46

United States Patent and Trademark Office Reg. No. 1,953,489

Reg. No. 1,953,489

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER

MONTEREY PASTA COMPANY

MONTEREY PASTA COMPANY (CALIFORNIA CORPORATION) 4125 BLACKHAWK PLAZA CIRCLE, SUITE 200 DANVILLE, CA 94506

FOR: PASTA AND SAUCES, IN CLASS 30 (U.S. CL. 46).
FIRST USE 6-0-1987; IN COMMERCE 6-0-1987.

OWNER OF U.S. REG. NO. 1,664,278. NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "PASTA COMPANY", APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN.

SER. NO. 74-802,510, FILED 6-17-1994.

ZHALEH DELANEY, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

Thank you for your request. Here are the latest results from the TARR web server.

This page was generated by the TARR system on 2008-03-06 14:31:38 ET

Serial Number: 74802510 Assignment Information Trademark Document Retrieval

Registration Number: 1953489

Mark (words only): MONTEREY PASTA COMPANY

Standard Character claim: No

Current Status: This registration has been renewed.

Date of Status: 2006-07-08

Filing Date: 1994-06-17

Transformed into a National Application: No

Registration Date: 1996-01-30

Register: Principal

Law Office Assigned: LAW OFFICE 101

If you are the applicant or applicant's attorney and have questions about this file, please contact the Trademark Assistance Center at TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov

Current Location: 40S -Scanning On Demand

Date In Location: 2006-09-27

LAST APPLICANT(S)/OWNER(S) OF RECORD

1. MONTEREY GOURMET FOODS, INC.

Address:

MONTEREY GOURMET FOODS, INC. 1528 MOFFETT STREET SALINAS, CA 93905

United States

Legal Entity Type: Corporation

State or Country of Incorporation: Delaware

GOODS AND/OR SERVICES

International Class: 030 Class Status: Active pasta and sauces

Basis: 1(a)

First Use Date: 1987-06-00

First Use in Commerce Date: 1987-06-00

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Disclaimer: "PASTA COMPANY"

Prior Registration Number(s):

1664278

MADRID PROTOCOL INFORMATION

(NOT AVAILABLE)

PROSECUTION HISTORY

NOTE: To view any document referenced below, click on the link to "Trademark Document Retrieval" shown near the top of this page.

2006-09-27 - Case File In TICRS

2006-07-08 - First renewal 10 year

2006-07-08 - Section 8 (10-year) accepted/ Section 9 granted

2006-07-08 - Assigned To Paralegal

2006-01-06 - Combined Section 8 (10-year)/Section 9 filed

2006-01-06 - TEAS Section 8 & 9 Received

2003-10-08 - TEAS Change Of Correspondence Received

2002-01-10 - Section 8 (6-year) accepted & Section 15 acknowledged

2001-11-13 - Response received to Post Registration action - Sections 8 & 15

2001-11-13 - Section 8 (6-year) and Section 15 Filed

2001-05-11 - Post Registration action mailed Section 8 & 15

2001-02-02 - Section 8 (6-year) and Section 15 Filed

1996-01-30 - Registered - Principal Register

1995-11-07 - Published for opposition

1995-10-06 - Notice of publication

1995-08-14 - Approved for Pub - Principal Register (Initial exam)

1995-08-14 - Amendment to Use approved

1995-08-14 - Assigned To Examiner

1995-08-14 - Assigned To Examiner

1995-07-25 - Assigned To Examiner

1995-04-28 - Communication received from applicant

1995-07-12 - Amendment to use processing complete

1995-04-28 - Amendment to Use filed

1995-06-30 - Divisional processing completed

1994-11-22 - Non-final action mailed

1994-11-02 - Assigned To Examiner

ATTORNEY/CORRESPONDENT INFORMATION

Attorney of Record

KAREN K ROBERTS ESQ

Correspondent

Debra E. Keller, Esq. Shapiro Buchman Provine & Patton LLP 1333 N. California Blvd. Suite 350 Walnut Creek CA 94596

Phone Number: 925-944-9700 Fax Number: 925-944-9701

Int. Cl.: 30

Prior U.S. Cl.: 46

Reg. No. 2,203,576 Registered Nov. 17, 1998

United States Patent and Trademark Office

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER



MONTEREY PASTA COMPANY (DELAWARE CORPORATION) 1528 MOFFETT STREET SALINAS, CA 93905

FOR: PASTA AND SAUCES, IN CLASS 30 (U.S. CL. 46).

FIRST USE 6-0-1996; IN COMMERCE 7-0-1996.

OWNER OF U.S. REG. NOS. 1,664,278, 1,951,624, AND 1,953,489.

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "CALIFORNIA'S FINEST

GOURMET PASTA" AND "PASTA CO." APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN.

THE STIPPLING IS A FEATURE OF THE MARK AND IS NOT INTENDED TO INDICATE COLOR. THE LINING IS A FEATURE OF THE MARK AND IS NOT INTENDED TO INDICATE COLOR.

SEC. 2(F) AS TO "MONTEREY".

SER. NO. 75-252,882, FILED 3-6-1997.

ANGELA BISHOP WILSON, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS						
MONTEREY GOURMET FOODS, INC., a Delaware corporation			WINDSOR QUALITY FOOD COMPANY, LTD., a Texas Limited Partnership; and DOES 1 through 20						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff MONTEREY (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant HARRIS (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Kno	own)					
John H. Patton, Cal. SBN 069261 Shapiro Buchman Provine & Patton LLP 1333 N. California Blvd., Suite 350 Walnut Creek, CA 94596									
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)						
1 U.S. Government 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citiz	PTF DEF PTF DEF izen of This State 1 lncorporated or Principal Place 4 4						
2 U.S. Government 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 GBusiness In Another State							□ 5
			en or Subject of a oreign Country	3 	☐ 3 —————	Foreign Nation		6	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only			ODEELT IDE O	13.1.4.7 (B)3.1		A STATE OF THE STA	077		T WORK
CONTRACT TO 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJU		ORFEITURE/PE	LNAL I Y		Appeal 28 USC 158		IER STAT ate Reapporti	
120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 196 Franchise 220 Forec losure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 240 Other Cell Rights 244 Other Civil Rights 244 Other Ci	□ 362 Personal Injury- Med. Malpracti 365 Personal Injury- Product Liabilit □ 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPE □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lendin □ 380 Other Personal □ Property Damag □ 700 Personal	ty contact to the total	620 Other Food & 625 Drug Related of Property 2 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other 710 Fair Labor Stract 720 Labor/Mgmt. & Disclosure 740 Railway Labor 791 Empl. Ret. Inc Security Act 1462 Naturalization A 463 Habeas Corpu	Seizure 1 USC 881 I USC 88	423	Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights	410 Ar 430 Ba 450 Co 460 De 470 Ra Co 480 Co 480 Co 850 Se 875 Cu 891 Aa 892 Ec 893 Er 894 Er 895 Fr Ac	titirust nks and Barl mks and Barl mmerce portation cketeer Influ mrupt Organi insumer Cred ble/Sat TV lective Servic curities/Com cchange istomer Chall USC 3410 her Statutory pricultural Ac onomic Statuvironmental lergy Allocat eddom of Infect peal of Fee etermination nder Equal A Justice institutionalit ate Statutes	enced and zations list the modities/ lenge Actions its illization Act Matters ion Act formation cocess
Proceeding State Court Appe	llate Court	Reinstat Reopen	ted or 5 and	cify)	ct [6 Multidistrict Litigation	7	Appeal to D Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 U.S.C.A. 1114(1) and 1125(a) Brief description of cause: Complaint for trademark infringement, unfair competition and false description									
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complete COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 CHECK YES only if demanded in complete COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: ▼ Yes No								•	
	R TO CIVIL L.R. 3-1 ELATED CASE	12 CON	CERNING REQ	UIREME	ENT TO	FILE			
IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3- (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)			RANCISCO/OA	KLANI	2	□ SAN JOSE			
DATE March 6, 2008	SIGNATURE	VITORN	FEY OF RECORD	U	2				